



APPLICATION NO. 10/673,866, TWISTER WINGS SAILBOAT

Edward L. Linsley

DETAILED RESPONSE TO LETTER DATED 12/17/2007 BY ED SWINEHART

TITLE OF INVENTION

The title of my invention is very descriptive, as stated in my Patent Specification in various places. See the Summary, page 3 and the Abstract, page 32. Your suggestion, Stabilizing Wings, implies activated wings such as used for minimizing rocking on passenger ships. The fixed wings on my boat, tilted up at a dihedral angle, are used simultaneously when the boat rolls a wing to the water during its normal sailing mode. The high efficiency hydrodynamic wing-in-the-water pushes up at an outboard position while the weight of the sailors riding at an elevated position on the opposite wing, push down at their location. All of the designs in the Specification are intended to be sailed that way. See the preferred Flared Seat version in Figs. 5 and 6 in the Patent Application. The very name, Twister Wings Sailboat, gives meaning to the new principal that makes the boat unique. A new title is not required.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

The patent information disclosures filed in 2006 were a result of having to refile an exact copy of my original Patent Application which was lost by the Patent Office.

My search in 2003 did not uncover any winged sailboat concept which even remotely suggested the function of my Twister Wings Sailboat. The search resulted in two separate folders and both were included with the Specification. The first was a search of patents with an extensive numerical list, followed by copies and analysis of six of those patents. The second folder was a coverage of prior manufactured art from various publications.

The requested Information Disclosure Statement is presented as a separate enclosure herein along with the previous analysis of the six patents listed. In addition, a secondary list is also presented, based upon my first survey, as indicated by the (*) in the tabulated list of patents. A short analysis of these is also included. The second folder of prior manufactured art is not repeated here since there is no change to the original presentation which accompanied the application.

CLAIMS

The original problem with the Patent Office occurred on Oct. 6, 2003, seven days after my Specification became Patent Pending on Sept. 29, 2003. A Ms. Streater called to inform me that my claims were all independent instead of having six dependent claims. In order to expedite my patent, I agreed to pay \$168.00 which was charged to my credit card on file. Two years later, I determined that a change to a **bold 1** on the first independent claim was initiated on Oct 1, 2003,

two days after my specification was received by the Patent Office. After I called it a theft, Mr. Steven Brantley, Office of Petitions, stated that my \$168.00 would be refunded. If so, it was never returned to my credit card account. Then I have observed that each Filing Receipt on 12/21/2005, 04/28/2006, and 03/14/2007, shows FIL FEE REC'D, OF \$543. When I filed on 09/29/2003, the small entity filing fee was \$375. Add that \$168 to it and it equals \$543. So this refund was just tacked onto my original filing fee. Explain that! Furthermore, these same confirmation letters still show seven independent claims. That's not all. Someone decided to change my filing date to 11/22/2005. That did it. I called Mr. Brantley again and demanded that it revert back to the original date. Now the Filing Receipt of 03/14/2007, shows the original date. There's more, but that's enough for now.

In a discussion with Steven Brantley on November 7, 2006, he stated that he did not understand my claims, which stands alone as a beneficial statement. I reviewed my manual and determined the criteria for stating the claims and sent a revised claims to him on November 29, 2006. However, this was just another communiqué that was lost in the Patent Office. Therefore, ignore any claims that you have and consider only the revised claims enclosed with this response.

I have defined one independent and two dependent claims. These adequately describe the attachment of the wings, but not their function which is stated in the Specification. A separate enclosure presents these Claims. One part discusses the Claims which is followed by a single sheet of Claims which is formatted for inclusion in the patent proposal.

NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED

This is addressed in a separate enclosure.

CREDIT CARD ON FILE INACTIVATED

This is a notice that my credit card on file with the Patent Office is no longer valid and should be deleted.

I am requesting that you implement this change since my messages are rarely acknowledged. From now-on, I will pay fees by check if I can determine a valid mailing address.